

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 12, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 19 was rejected as being anticipated by Soles. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-14, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over King in view of Atwell '201. Claims 16, 17 and 19 were also rejected as being unpatentable over King in view of Powell '988. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-14, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Soles in view of Powell '988. Claims 10 and 11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Soles in view of Powell '988 and further in view of Martucci '084. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, each of the independent claims 1, 16 and 19 have been amended by the present amendment. These claims have each been amended to recite that the first layer has an inner surface and the jacket has an outer surface. Each of these claims has also been amended to recite that a skin is formed on at least one of the inner surface and/or the outer surface. (Claim 20 is newly added and recites that a skin is formed on both the inner surface and the outer surface.) Support for this feature can be found at least at page 10 of the application, which describes the skin as well as pages 10 and 11 which further describe methods for forming such a skin according to this aspect of this feature being recited in the amended claims.

Each of the references used in the rejections has been reviewed, but none is believed to teach or suggest the presently recited feature of forming a skin on at least one of the inner or outer layer of a hose assembly having the other features of the layers as recited in the remainder of each of these claims, respectively. Therefore, further comment on each of the references as they were applied against the previous claims, or any further comments about the Office Action's proposed combinations of these references is not deemed necessary at this time. Further, with regard to the outstanding rejections, even though the claims have been amended, Applicants do not necessarily concede that any teachings, suggestions or motivation exist for the Office Action's proposed combinations.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that no such teaching, suggestion or motivation for combining features from the references, as proposed by the Examiner, exist, and Applicants reserve the right to continue prosecution with regard to the prior claims at any time.


It is also respectfully submitted that the present amendment, including the feature of forming a skin on at least one of the inner and outer layer in combination with the other features of those claims, also renders these claims fully patentable over the references, whether taken singly or in combination. Therefore, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding before issuing another action.

In the event any extensions of time are required for this paper to be considered timely, Applicants hereby make a conditional petition therefor. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 79287.21620.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings
Reg. No. 32,902

Date: January 12, 2007
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Direct: 202-861-1696
Facsimile: 202-861-1783